

REMARKS

Claims 6–21, 27, 68–76, and 85–88 are in pending in the application.

Claims 7–10 and 16–18 have been allowed.

Claims 6, 11-15, 19-21, 27, 68-76 and 85-88 were rejected.

Claims 7, 11, 13, 19, 27, 68, 69, 70, 85 and 86 have been amended.

In this Response claim 19 has been amended at line 4 to show the word ""support" in ~~strikeout~~, as ~~support~~. Also, In claim 70, line 11, the word "support" has been added in ~~strikeout~~, as ~~support~~. Further, in claim 69, line 11, the word and has been added to refer to "hook and loop fastener."

The courtesy of Examiners Todd M. Epps and Alfred J. Wujciak in conducting a personal interview with the undersigned attorney on June 22, 2006, and a follow-up telephone interview on June 26, 2006, is noted with appreciation. During the interview a prototype of the invention was shown to and operated before the Examiners.

As is indicated above claims 7, 11, 13, 19, 27, 68, 69, 70, 85 and 86 have been amended. In a number of the claims the words referring to supporting a cover from a base has been amended to read "to mount the cover to the base." This change was suggested by the Examiners during the interviews. Initially the magnet mechanism mounts the cover to the base to hold the cover and base together. After the mechanical retainer, e.g., note claims 7, 11, 13, 19, and 27, or the second attachment, e.g., note claims 68 and 70, is made active, it also can retain the cover and base together if the magnet mechanism were to become released. Similar changes also were made to method claims 85 and 86, at the suggestion of the Examiners.

Serial No.: 10/007,509

During the interview the distinctions of the invention over the applied references were discussed. For example, it was pointed out to the Examiners that although Niederhost discloses a magnetic key, that key does not mount a cover to a base; it merely locks the cover from rotating relative to the base. Niederhost does not disclose a magnetic device to mount the cover to the base. Niederhost also does not disclose a fixture mounting structure, as is set forth in claim 6, for example, including both a magnetic device to mount the cover to the base and a selectively operable mechanical retainer to provide retention of the cover to the base. Similar recitations are in a number of the other independent claims, e.g., apparatus type claims 11, 13, 19, 27, and 68 and method claims 85 and 86, as is mentioned above. Claim 69 is directed to a mounting system that includes a multi-retention mechanism to hold a base and mounting member together, and the multi-retention mechanism includes a mechanical attachment that is selectively operable to release and hold and operates using a positive lock, and a second attachment that operates responsive to a positional relationship; that second attachment comprises hook and loop fastener. Claim 70 also is directed to a mounting system that includes a multi-retention mechanism, including two attachments, one that is selectively operable to release and hold and operates using a positive lock and a second attachment that is selectively operable independently from the one mechanical attachment to release and hold and operates responsive to a positional relationship to mount the mounting member to the base.

The Examiners tentatively indicated that independent claims 6, 11, 13, 19, 27, 68, 69, 70, 85 and 86 are allowable, subject to updating the search.

Regarding claim 85, it is noted that there appears to be a redundancy in this claim, and although it has been tentatively indicated allowable, the undersigned proposes a further amendment to claim 85 to delete the redundancy and, thus, to eliminate any possible indefiniteness in that claim. In the third paragraph and in the fourth paragraph of claim 85, the third paragraph points out "applying a force to the tool to release a second holding mechanism...", and the fourth paragraph points out

Serial No.: 10/007,509

"wherein the step of applying the force to the tool to release the second holding mechanism includes releasing the second holding mechanism...". It is believed these two clauses are redundant. Therefore, it is suggested that claim 85 would be amended at the fourth paragraph to delete the entire "whereby..." clause, i.e., from the word "whereby" to the end of the claim. If this change were made, the fourth clause of claim 85 would read, "withdrawing the suspended subassembly." If the Examiners agree to this change, the undersigned would authorize such change to be made by Examiner's Amendment or would make the change in a further Response to the Final Rejection.

The independent claims were discussed during the interviews and are discussed above. The dependent claims point out additional features of the invention and further distinguish over the prior art.

Entry of this Amendment after Final Rejection respectfully is requested. For the reasons expressed above it is believed that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance. However, even if all claims are not allowed, this Amendment reduces issues for appeal as the Examiners tentatively indicated all claims to appear to be allowable, subject to updating the search. The amendments to the claims were not previously made because they were not discussed with Examiner Baxter during the personal interview previously held with her; rather the language in the claims as submitted in the Amendment in response to the first substantive Office Action of April 29, 2005, was drawn along points discussed with Examiner Baxter. It is understood that Examiner Baxter has resigned as a patent examiner and this patent application has been reassigned to Examiner Epps.

In addition to the allowance of claims 7-10 and 16-18, it is submitted that for the above reasons claims 6, 11-15, 19-21, 27, 68-76, and 85-88 also are allowable. Accordingly, it is believed that all claims now are allowable and that all rejections should be withdrawn and the application allowed.

Serial No.: 10/007,509

If there are any questions or if the Examiners feel that a further interview, either in person or by telephone, would be helpful to advance favorable prosecution, they are invited to telephone applicant's undersigned attorney.

A Petition for two month Extension of Time and the fee were filed with the prior Response that was filed June 28, 2006. If another Extension is needed, please consider this a request for an Extension, and charge the fee for the extension to applicant's attorneys' deposit account 18-0988 (under the above docket number).

If any additional fee is required, please charge the fee to Applicant's Attorney's Deposit Account No. 18-0988 (under the above Docket Number).

Respectfully submitted,

RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

/Warren A Sklar/
Warren A. Sklar
Reg. No. 26,373

DATE: July 12, 2006

The Keith Building
1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8(a)

I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage for first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents address below.

 X being transmitted via EFS or via facsimile to **(571) 273-8300 (Centralized Facsimile Number)** at the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office to the Attention of **Examiner Todd M. Epps**.

/Warren A Sklar/
Warren A. Sklar

July 12, 2006
Date